



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/571,279	12/26/2006	Keiko Takahashi	1056-0133PUS1	6051
2292 7590 01/09/2009 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				
EXAMINER LOEWE, SUN JAE Y				
ART UNIT 1626		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 01/09/2009		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/571,279

Applicant(s)

TAKAHASHI ET AL.

Examiner

SUN JAE Y. LOEWE

Art Unit

1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 September 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,7-16 and 23-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,23-28 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-16 and 23-28 are pending in the instant application. Claims 7-16 remain withdrawn.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendments to the claims filed on September 19, 2008 have been fully considered. The 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph rejection has been obviated and is thus hereby withdrawn.

3. The following grounds of rejection are maintained and hereby made FINAL: a) 35 USC 112 1st paragraph written description – claim 1 (Section 6); b) 35 USC 112 1st paragraph enablement – claims 1, 3, 5, 24 and 25 (Section 7).

Note: Section numbers refer to those from the office action dated March 26, 2008.

4. The following new grounds of rejection were necessitated by Applicant's amendment: a) 35 USC 112 1st paragraph (below, Section 5); b) 35 USC 112 2nd paragraph (below, Section 6).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 1st Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 26-28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the

specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The standard for determining whether the specification meets the enablement requirement was cast in the Supreme Court decision of *Mineral Separation v. Hyde*, 242 U.S. 261, 270 (1916) which postured the question: is the experimentation needed to practice the invention undue or unreasonable? That standard is still the one to be applied. *In re Wands*, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8USPQ2s 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988). MPEP 2164.01(a) states “There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is undue”. The factors are applied below to the instant claims.

Note: based on the discussion provided in Section 5 and 6, the specification is enabling only for the preparation of olmesartan medoxomil identified by the full XRD peak pattern shown in Figure 2. The analysis below is limited to pharmaceutical compositions comprising this single enabled crystalline form, because pharmaceutical compositions comprising crystalline forms of olmesartan medoxomil cannot be prepared in the absence of the crystalline form.

The breadth of the claims and nature of invention

Pharmaceutical composition comprising crystalline form.

The state of the prior art and level of predictability

It is well known that polymorphs convert to thermodynamically preferred forms unintentionally upon exposure to the energetics of pharmaceutical processing (Brittain et al., p. 332 1st paragraph, p. 334 1st paragraph), for example: production of bulk drug substance (Brittain et al., p. 333), particle size reduction (Brittain et al., p. 334), granulation (Brittain et al., p. 339). Furthermore, it is known in the art that the solid structure of a compound is lost when that compound is placed in solution (for example, see 1st paragraph 1, page 2 of <http://www.expresspharmaonline.com/20031023/edit02.shtml>). Therefore, the level of predictability is low in the art for preserving a particular crystalline form through the process of making a pharmaceutical composition. Absent a

teaching of how the instantly claimed crystalline form can be maintained through the steps involved in pharmaceutical processing, one of ordinary skill would not know how to prepare pharmaceutical compositions of the instantly claimed crystalline form, while avoiding potential transformations that likely occur during the formulation process.

The amount of direction and working examples provided

No working examples of the claimed pharmaceutical compositions are provided. No guidance is given for the method of making pharmaceutical compositions while maintaining the specifically claimed crystal form.

The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention

Based on the lack of direction in the instant disclosure, in view of the low level of predictability in the art, one of ordinary skill is not enabled to make pharmaceutical compositions. The quantity of experimentation to practice the claimed invention is undue.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 2nd Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 23-25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

“Substantially” is a relative term that is not defined in the instant specification. Pursuant MPEP § 2173.05(b).F, a specific standard of measuring the degree intended must be defined. Appropriate correction is requested.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUN JAE Y. LOEWE whose telephone number is (571)272-9074. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 Est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph McKane can be reached on (571)272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Art Unit: 1626

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sun Jac Y. Loewe/

1-2-2008

/REI-TSANG SHIAO /

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1626